

# FLUCTUATIONS FOR A CONSERVATIVE INTERFACE MODEL ON A WALL

LORENZO ZAMBOTTI

**ABSTRACT.** We consider an effective interface model on a hard wall in (1+1) dimensions, with conservation of the area between the interface and the wall. We prove that the equilibrium fluctuations of the height variable converge in law to the solution of a SPDE with reflection and conservation of the space average. The proof is based on recent results obtained with L. Ambrosio and G. Savaré on stability properties of Markov processes with log-concave invariant measures.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 60K35; 60H15; 82B05

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper concerns fluctuations of a  $\nabla\phi$  interface model on a hard wall with conservation of the area between the interface and the wall. The system is defined on the one-dimensional lattice  $\Gamma_N := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and the location of the interface at time  $t$  is represented by the height variables  $\phi_t = \{\phi_t(x), x \in \Gamma_N\} \in \Omega_N^+ := [0, \infty)^{\Gamma_N}$  measured from the wall  $\Gamma_N$ .

In order to describe the dynamics of  $\phi_t$  we need some notation. Let  $\{(w_t(x))_{t \geq 0} : x = 1, \dots, N\}$  be independent standard Brownian motions and define the  $N \times N$  matrices

$$\sigma := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & & & & \\ 1 & \cdot & & & \\ & \cdot & \cdot & & \\ & & 1 & -1 & \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^T := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & & & \\ & \cdot & \cdot & & \\ & & \cdot & \cdot & \\ & & & -1 & 1 \\ & & & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then the dynamics of  $(\phi_t(x) : x \in \Gamma_N)_{t \geq 0}$ , height from the wall of the reflected interface, is governed by the stochastic differential equation of the Skorohod type

$$d\phi_t = -\sigma\sigma^T\{\sigma V'(\sigma^T\phi_t)dt + dl_t\} + \sqrt{2}\sigma dw_t \quad (1.1)$$

for all  $x \in \Gamma_N$ , subject to the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t(x) &\geq 0, & t \mapsto l_t(x) &\text{continuous and non-decreasing,} & l_0(x) &= 0, \\ \int_0^\infty \phi_t(x) dl_t(x) &= 0, & x &\in \Gamma_N. \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

We refer to [7] for an introduction to interface models.

Throughout the paper the potential  $V$  satisfies the following conditions

(V1) (convexity)  $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$  is convex and  $\lim_{|r| \rightarrow \infty} V(r) = +\infty$ .

---

*Key words and phrases.* Equilibrium fluctuations; Interface model; Stochastic partial differential equations; hard wall.

Notice that for a convex  $V$

$$\lim_{|r| \rightarrow \infty} V(r) = +\infty \iff \int \exp(-V) dr < \infty \iff V(r) \geq a + b|r| \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{R},$$

for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b > 0$ . In particular we have

$$q := \int_{\mathbb{R}} r^2 \exp(-V(r)) dr < \infty \quad (1.3)$$

$$(V2) \text{ (normalization), } \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-V(r)) dr = 1.$$

$$(V3) \text{ (0 mean), } \int_{\mathbb{R}} r \exp(-V(r)) dr = 0.$$

The normalization (V2) does not affect equation (1.1), where only  $V'$  appears.

We shall prove in the following sections existence and uniqueness of solutions of (1.1) and other properties.

**1.1. The main result.** For any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $\Lambda_N : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto L^2(0, 1)$ ,

$$\Lambda_N(\phi)(\theta) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi(\lfloor N\theta \rfloor + 1), \quad \theta \in [0, 1), \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  denotes the integer part, and we define the spaces

$$H_N = \Lambda_N(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset L^2(0, 1), \quad \Omega_N^+ := (\mathbb{R}_+)^N, \quad K_N := \Lambda_N(\Omega_N^+).$$

Notice that  $K_N$  can be identified with the space of non-negative functions on  $[0, 1)$  being constant on  $I(x) = [(x-1)/N, x/N)$  for all  $x \in \Gamma_N$ .

For all  $k \in K_N$  and  $t \geq 0$  we define now the rescaled interface  $\Phi^N$

$$\Phi_t^N := \Lambda_N(\phi_{N^4 t}), \quad \Phi_0^N := \Lambda_N(\phi_0).$$

In other words

$$\Phi_t^N(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi_{N^4 t}(\lfloor N\theta \rfloor + 1), \quad \theta \in [0, 1).$$

In the main result of this paper, i.e. Theorem 1.1 below, we state the weak convergence of  $\Phi^N$  to the unique solution  $u$  of the following stochastic Cahn-Hilliard equation on  $[0, 1]$  with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition and reflection at  $u = 0$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \left( \frac{1}{q} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \theta^2} + \eta \right) + \sqrt{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \dot{W}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta}(t, 0) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta}(t, 1) = \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial \theta^3}(t, 0) = \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial \theta^3}(t, 1) = 0, \\ u(0, \theta) = u_0(\theta), \quad \theta \in [0, 1] \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\dot{W}$  is a space-time white noise on  $[0, +\infty) \times [0, 1]$ ,  $u$  is a continuous function of  $(t, \theta) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, 1]$ ,  $\eta$  is a locally finite positive measure on  $(0, +\infty) \times [0, 1]$ , subject to the constraint

$$u \geq 0, \quad \int_{(0, +\infty) \times [0, 1]} u d\eta = 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Such equation has been studied in [5], see Proposition 6.1 below.

With an abuse of notation, we say that a sequence of measures  $(\mathbf{P}_n)$  on  $C([a, b]; L^2(0, 1))$  converges weakly in  $C([a, b]; L_w^2(0, 1))$  if, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in C^1([0, 1])$ , the

process  $(\langle X_\cdot, h_i \rangle_{L^2(0,1)}, i = 1, \dots, m)$  under  $(\mathbf{P}_n)$  converges weakly in  $C([a, b]; \mathbb{R}^m)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then we can state the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $\Phi_0^N \rightarrow u_0$  in  $L^2(0, 1)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  with*

$$\Phi_0^N \geq 0, \quad \int_0^1 \Phi_0^N(\theta) d\theta = c > 0 \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N},$$

*then, for any  $0 < \varepsilon \leq T < \infty$ , the law of  $(\Phi_t^N, t \in [\varepsilon, T])$  converges to the law of the unique solution  $u$  of (1.5), weakly in  $C([\varepsilon, T]; L_w^2(0, 1))$ .*

**1.2. A conservative dynamics.** The starting point of this work is the paper by Funaki and Olla [8]. In that paper, the following  $\nabla\phi$  interface model on a hard wall is considered

$$d\phi_t(x) = -\sigma V'(\sigma^T \phi_t) dt + dl_t(x) + \sqrt{2} dw_t(x), \quad x \in \Gamma_N, \quad (1.7)$$

with constraints analogous to (1.2) and Dirichlet boundary condition  $\phi_t(0) = \phi_t(N+1) = 0$ . Using the definition (1.4), it is then proven that in the stationary case, the process  $(\Lambda_N(\phi_{N^2 t}), t \geq 0)$  converges in law as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to the law of the unique stationary solution of the second order equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{q} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \theta^2} + \eta + \sqrt{2} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial t \partial \theta} \\ u(t, 0) = u(t, 1) = 0, \quad t \geq 0 \\ u \geq 0, \quad d\eta \geq 0, \quad \int u d\eta = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

At the end of the introduction of [8], it is remarked that it would be more natural to consider a stochastic dynamics conserving the area between the interface and the wall, namely  $\sum_x \phi(x)$ . Such conservative dynamics, but without the hard wall constraint, has indeed been studied in [10] and [11], where respectively hydrodynamic limit and large deviations are considered; the hydrodynamic scaling limit of the interface is the solution of a fourth-order equation, as predicted in [12].

The SDE (1.1) combines the hard wall and the conservation of volume constraints; indeed,  $\sigma^T \mathbf{1} = 0$ , where  $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , and it is easy to see that

$$d \left[ \sum_{x=1}^N \phi_t(x) \right] = \sum_{x=1}^N [\sigma^T \mathbf{1}] (x) \left\{ -[\sigma^T \{\sigma V'(\sigma^T \phi_t) dt + dl_t\}] (x) + \sqrt{2} dw_t(x) \right\} = 0.$$

The main novelty of this paper is the use of a technique recently developed in [2] for the convergence in law of stochastic processes associated with symmetric Dirichlet forms of gradient type and with log-concave invariant measures; see section 2 below. The general principle is in fact very simple: this class of reversible dynamics is parametrized by two objects, the invariant measure and the scalar product of the Hilbert space which defines the gradient. If such objects converge (in a sense to be made precise), it is natural to conjecture that the associated processes converge; the results of [2] confirm this conjecture in the case of log-concave reference measures: see section 2 below.

The solutions of equations (1.1), (1.5), (1.7) and (1.8) are all in this class and the techniques of [2] give a general framework to prove results like Theorem 1.1 or the convergence result of [8]. We recall that [8] is based on monotonicity properties, which are rather special properties of (1.7)-(1.8), not shared by (1.1)-(1.5). One can notice that, given the general

results of [2], the proof of convergence of equilibrium fluctuations as in [8] and in this paper becomes much easier.

We also notice that Theorem 1.1 is comparatively stronger than the analogous statement in [8]. Indeed, we consider a convex microscopic interaction potential  $V$ , instead of a strictly convex and symmetric one. Moreover the convergence is proven not only in the stationary case, but for any sequence of initial conditions which converge under the rescaling (1.4). Using the techniques of this paper, one could improve correspondingly the results of [8].

Finally, we notice that the boundary conditions we consider are of Neumann type, like in [6], while many other papers consider the Dirichlet (see e.g. [8]) or the periodic (see e.g. [10]) case. The case of periodic boundary condition could be proven with no additional difficulty with the techniques of this paper. Indeed, like in the Neumann case, the invariant measure of the limit SPDE is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Gaussian invariant probability measure of the linear SPDE (i.e. without reflection). The weak convergence of the rescaled stationary measures is then a simple consequence of a standard invariance principle: see the proof of Proposition 6.2.

For the case of homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, on the contrary, the invariant measure of the limit SPDE is singular w.r.t. the Gaussian invariant probability measure of the linear SPDE, due to the interplay of the homogeneous boundary conditions and the non-negativity constraint. This makes the convergence of the rescaled invariant measures more delicate. In fact, we could prove the results of this paper for Dirichlet boundary condition, if we could prove the following invariance principle: we consider a random walk  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , with step distribution  $X_i \sim e^{-V} dx$ , conditioned to be non-negative (i.e.  $S_1, \dots, S_N \geq 0$ ), to be 0 at time  $N$  (i.e.  $S_N = 0$ ) and to have a fixed sum (i.e.  $\sum_{n=1}^N S_n = cN^{3/2}$ ,  $c > 0$ ); then we would like to prove that such processes converge under Brownian rescaling as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to a Brownian excursion  $e$  conditioned to have integral  $c$  (i.e.  $\int_0^1 e_x dx = c$ ). Since we have not found a proof for this invariance principle, we restrict to the Neumann case, for which we can prove convergence of the stationary measures. In the Dirichlet boundary condition case the limit SPDE would be an analog of (1.5), with boundary conditions

$$u(t, 0) = u(t, 1) = \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial \theta^3}(t, 0) = \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial \theta^3}(t, 1) = 0,$$

i.e. Dirichlet for  $u$  and Neumann for  $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \theta^2}$ . Such equation is studied in [13].

## 2. A GENERAL CONVERGENCE RESULT

In this section we recall the results of [2], already mentioned in the introduction. It turns out that the processes  $(\phi_t)$  and  $(u(t, \cdot))$ , solutions of (1.1) and (1.5) respectively, are both *monotone gradient systems*, i.e. the equation they satisfy can be interpreted as follows

$$dX = -\nabla U(X) dt + \sqrt{2} dW$$

where  $W$  is a Wiener process in a Hilbert space  $H$  and  $U : H \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is a convex potential. These processes are reversible and associated with a gradient-type Dirichlet form. The general results of existence and convergence of such processes given in [2], have a nice application in the present setting. Hence we devote this section to recall them.

Let  $H$  be a separable Hilbert space with scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$  and let  $\gamma$  be a probability measure on  $H$ . We suppose that  $\gamma$  is *log-concave*, i.e. for all pairs of open sets  $B, C \subset H$

$$\log \gamma((1-t)B + tC) \geq (1-t) \log \gamma(B) + t \log \gamma(C) \quad \forall t \in (0, 1). \quad (2.1)$$

If  $H = \mathbb{R}^k$ , then the class of log-concave probability measures contains all measures of the form (here  $\mathcal{L}_k$  stands for Lebesgue measure)

$$\gamma := \frac{1}{Z} e^{-U} \mathcal{L}_k, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $U : H = \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is convex and  $Z := \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-U} dx < +\infty$ , see Theorem 9.4.11 in [1], in particular all Gaussian measures. Notice that the class of log-concave measures is closed under weak convergence. Moreover, if  $\gamma$  is log-concave and  $K$  is a convex set with  $\gamma(K) > 0$ , then the conditional measure  $\gamma(\cdot|K) := \gamma(\cdot \cap K)/\gamma(K)$  is also log-concave.

We denote the support of  $\gamma$  by  $K = K(\gamma)$  and the smallest closed affine subspace of  $H$  containing  $K$  by  $A = A(\gamma)$ . We write canonically

$$A = H^0 + h^0, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $H^0 = H^0(\gamma)$  is a closed linear subspace of  $H$  and  $h^0 = h^0(\gamma)$  is the element of minimal norm in  $A$ . We endow  $H^0$  with the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^0}$  induced by  $H$ .

We want to consider a stochastic processes with values in  $A$  and reversible with respect to  $\gamma$ . We denote by  $C_b(H)$  the space of bounded continuous functions in  $H$  and by  $C_b^1(A)$  the space of all  $\Phi : A \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  which are bounded, continuous and Fréchet differentiable. To  $\varphi \in C_b^1(A)$  we associate a gradient  $\nabla_{H^0} \varphi : A \mapsto H^0$ , defined by

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \varphi(k + \varepsilon h) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \nabla_{H^0} \varphi(k), h \rangle_{H^0}, \quad \forall k \in A, h \in H^0. \quad (2.4)$$

We denote by  $X_t : K^{[0, +\infty[} \rightarrow K$  the coordinate process  $X_t(\omega) := \omega_t$ ,  $t \geq 0$ . Finally, we denote the set of probability measures on  $H$  by  $\mathcal{P}(H)$  and we set

$$\mathcal{P}_2(H) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(H) : \int_H \|x\|_H^2 d\mu(x) < \infty \right\},$$

Then we recall one of the main results of [2].

**Theorem 2.1** (Markov process and Dirichlet form associated with  $\gamma$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{H^0}$ ).

(a) The bilinear form  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H^0}}$  given by

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v) := \int_K \langle \nabla_{H^0} u, \nabla_{H^0} v \rangle_{H^0} d\gamma, \quad u, v \in C_b^1(A), \quad (2.5)$$

is closable in  $L^2(\gamma)$  and its closure  $(\mathcal{E}, D(\mathcal{E}))$  is a symmetric Dirichlet Form. Furthermore, the associated semigroup  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  in  $L^2(\gamma)$  maps  $L^\infty(\gamma)$  in  $C_b(K)$ .

(b) There exists a unique Markov family  $(\mathbb{P}_x : x \in K)$  of probability measures on  $K^{[0, +\infty[}$  associated with  $\mathcal{E}$ . More precisely,  $\mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)] = P_t f(x)$  for all bounded Borel functions and all  $x \in K$ .

(c) For all  $x \in K$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_x^*(C([0, +\infty[; H)) = 1$  and  $\mathbb{E}_x[\|X_t - x\|^2] \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \downarrow 0$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{P}_x^*(C([0, +\infty[; H)) = 1$  for  $\gamma$ -a.e.  $x \in K$ .

(d)  $(\mathbb{P}_x : x \in K)$  is reversible with respect to  $\gamma$ , i.e. the transition semigroup  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is symmetric in  $L^2(\gamma)$ ; moreover  $\gamma$  is invariant for  $(P_t)$ , i.e.  $\gamma(P_t f) = \gamma(f)$  for all  $f \in C_b(K)$  and  $t \geq 0$ .

(e) If  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ , then  $\gamma$  is the only invariant probability measure for  $(P_t)$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$ .

We shall see below that the solutions of (1.1), (1.5), (1.7) and (1.8) are all particular cases of the class of Markov processes described in Theorem 2.1. This fact will be crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

We consider now a sequence  $(\gamma_N)$  of log-concave probability measures on  $H$  such that  $\gamma_N$  converge weakly in  $H$  to  $\gamma$ . We denote by  $K_N$  the support of  $\gamma_N$ , and by  $A_N$  the smallest closed affine subspace of  $H$  containing  $K_N$ . We suppose that  $A_N \subseteq A$  for all  $N$ .

We write  $A_N = h_N^0 + H_N^0$ , where  $h_N^0 \in A_N$  and  $H_N^0 \subseteq H^0$  is a closed linear subspace of  $H$ . We want to consider situations where each  $H_N^0$  is a Hilbert space endowed with a scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_N^0}$ , possibly different from the scalar product induced by  $H^0$ . In order to ensure that this family of scalar products converges (in a suitable sense) to the scalar product of  $H^0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we will make the following assumptions.

- (1) There exists a finite constant  $\kappa \geq 1$  such that

$$\frac{1}{\kappa} \|h\|_{H^0} \leq \|h\|_{H_N^0} \leq \kappa \|h\|_{H^0} \quad \forall h \in H_N^0, N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.6)$$

- (2) Denoting by  $\Pi_N : H^0 \rightarrow H_N^0$  the orthogonal projections induced by the scalar product of  $H^0$ , we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} = \|h\|_{H^0} \quad \forall h \in H^0. \quad (2.7)$$

These assumptions guarantee in some weak sense that the geometry of  $H_N^0$  converges to the geometry of  $H^0$ ; the case when all scalar products coincide with  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ ,  $H_N^0 \subset H_{N+1}^0$  and  $\cup_N H_N^0$  is dense in  $H^0$  is obviously included.

Let  $(\mathbb{P}_x^N : x \in K_N)$  (respectively  $(\mathbb{P}_x : x \in K)$ ) be the Markov process in  $[0, +\infty[^{K_N}$  associated to  $\gamma_N$  (resp. in  $[0, +\infty[^K$  associated to  $\gamma$ ) given by Theorem 2.1. We denote by  $\mathbb{P}_{\gamma_N}^N := \int \mathbb{P}_x^N d\gamma_N(x)$  (resp.  $\mathbb{P}_\gamma := \int \mathbb{P}_x d\gamma(x)$ ) the associated stationary measures.

With an abuse of notation, we say that a sequence of measures  $(\mathbf{P}_n)$  on  $C([a, b]; H)$  converges weakly in  $C([a, b]; H_w)$  if, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in H$ , the process  $(\langle X, h_i \rangle_H, i = 1, \dots, m)$  under  $(\mathbf{P}_n)$  converges weakly in  $C([a, b]; \mathbb{R}^m)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In this setting we have the following stability and tightness result, also proven in [2].

**Theorem 2.2** (Stability and tightness). *Suppose that  $\gamma_N \rightarrow \gamma$  weakly in  $H$  and that the norms of  $H_N^0$  satisfy (2.6) and (2.7). Then, for any  $x_N \in K_N$  such that  $x_N \rightarrow x \in K$  in  $H$ , for any  $0 < \varepsilon \leq T < +\infty$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_{x_N}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_x$  weakly in  $C([\varepsilon, T]; H_w)$ ;*

This stability property means that the weak convergence of the invariant measures  $\gamma_N$  and a suitable convergence of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{H_N^0}$  to  $\|\cdot\|_{H^0}$  imply the convergence in law of the associated processes, starting from any initial condition.

We recall that the above results, proven in [2], are based on the interpretation of the Markov semigroup  $(P_t)$  as the solution of a gradient flow in  $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$  with respect to the relative entropy functional  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|\gamma)$  in the Wasserstein metric: see [2] for details.

In the rest of the paper we show how the results of this section apply to Theorem 1.1.

### 3. THE MICROSCOPIC DYNAMICS

On  $\mathbb{R}^N$  we consider the canonical scalar product and we denote it by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}$ , with associated norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}$ .

We define  $\mathbf{1} := (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and the vector space  $\mathbb{V}_N := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^N : v_1 + \dots + v_N = 0\} = \mathbf{1}^\perp$ . It is easy to see that the kernels of  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma^T$  are respectively  $\text{Ker}(\sigma) = \{(0, \dots, 0, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and  $\text{Ker}(\sigma^T) = \{t \cdot \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^N : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ; it follows that the image of  $\sigma$  is  $\text{Im}(\sigma) = (\text{Ker}(\sigma^T))^\perp = \mathbb{V}_N$  and that  $\text{Ker}(\sigma) \cap \mathbb{V}_N = \{0\}$ ; therefore  $\sigma : \mathbb{V}_N \mapsto \mathbb{V}_N$  is bijective,  $\sigma^{-1} : \mathbb{V}_N \mapsto \mathbb{V}_N$  is well defined and we can define the scalar product in  $\mathbb{V}_N$

$$\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{V}_N} := \langle \sigma^{-1} v_1, \sigma^{-1} v_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}, \quad \forall v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{V}_N.$$

We want now to give a useful representation of  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{V}_N}$ . Let  $(B_t, t \geq 0)$  be a standard Brownian motion and set

$$D_i := B_i - \frac{B_1 + B_2 + \cdots + B_N}{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad D := (D_1, \dots, D_N) \in \mathbb{V}_N. \quad (3.1)$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *For all  $v \in \mathbb{V}_N$*

$$\|v\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2 = \mathbb{E} [\langle v, D \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2] = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^i v_j \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $V \in \mathbb{V}_N$  such that  $\sigma V = v$ . Then  $\|v\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2 = \|V\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2$ . Moreover  $V_i = \sum_{j=1}^i v_j$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and in particular  $V_N = 0$  since  $v \in \mathbb{V}_N$ . Since  $\sigma^T D = (B_2 - B_1, \dots, B_N - B_{N-1}, 0)$  and  $V_N = 0$

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle v, D \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2] = \mathbb{E} [\langle V, \sigma^T D \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2] = \|V\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2 = \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2. \quad \square$$

Recall that  $\{(w_t(x))_{t \geq 0} : x = 1, \dots, N\}$  is an independent family of standard Brownian motions; then  $w = (w(1), \dots, w(N))$  is a Wiener process in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\sigma w$  is a Wiener process in  $\mathbb{V}_N$ , i.e. for all  $t \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle h, w_t \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2] = t \|h\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \mathbb{E} [\langle v, \sigma w_t \rangle_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2] = t \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{V}_N.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For all  $\phi_0 \in K_N$  there exists a unique pair  $(\phi_t, l_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , solution of (1.1). We use the notation  $\phi(t, \phi_0) = \phi_t$ ,  $t \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* We start by (pathwise) uniqueness. Let  $(\phi, l)$  and  $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{l})$  be solutions of (1.1) with initial condition  $\phi_0$ , resp.  $\bar{\phi}_0$ . Setting  $\psi_t := \phi_t - \bar{\phi}_t$ , by Itô's formula we obtain

$$d\langle \psi_t, \mathbf{1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} = \langle \sigma^T \mathbf{1}, -\sigma^T \{ \sigma(V'(\sigma^T \phi_t) - V'(\sigma^T \bar{\phi}_t)) dt + dl_t - d\bar{l}_t \} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} = 0$$

so that  $\langle \psi_t, \mathbf{1} \rangle = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and therefore  $\psi_t \in \mathbb{V}_N$ . Then, again by Itô's formula

$$d\langle \psi_t, \psi_t \rangle_{\mathbb{V}_N} = -\langle \sigma^T \psi_t, V'(\sigma^T \phi_t) - V'(\sigma^T \bar{\phi}_t) \rangle dt + \langle \psi, dl_t - d\bar{l}_t \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} \leq 0$$

since  $V'$  is monotone non-decreasing and by (1.2).

For or existence of (strong) solutions, we can refer to [3]. Indeed, setting  $\mathbf{1}_\phi := \langle \phi_0, \mathbf{1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{1}$  and  $\zeta_t := \phi_t - \mathbf{1}_\phi$ , (1.1) is equivalent to

$$d\zeta_t = -\sigma \sigma^T \{ \sigma V'(\sigma^T (\zeta_t + \mathbf{1}_\phi)) dt + dl_t \} + \sqrt{2} \sigma dw_t \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $x \in \Gamma_N$ , subject to the conditions

$$\zeta_t(x) + \langle \phi_0, \mathbf{1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N} \geq 0, \quad t \mapsto l_t(x) \text{ continuous and non-decreasing}, \quad l_0(x) = 0,$$

$$\int_0^\infty (\zeta_t(x) + \langle \phi_0, \mathbf{1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}) dl_t(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Gamma_N.$$

Equation (3.2) is a Skorohod problem in the convex set  $[0, \infty]^{\Gamma_N \cap \mathbb{V}_N}$ ; in other words,  $\zeta$  solves the stochastic differential inclusion

$$d\zeta \in -\partial U(\zeta_t) dt + \sqrt{2} \sigma dw_t$$

where  $U : \mathbb{V}_N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is the convex potential

$$U(\zeta) := \begin{cases} \sum_{x=2}^N V(\zeta(x) - \zeta(x-1)), & \text{if } \zeta + \mathbf{1}_\phi \in [0, \infty]^{\Gamma_N \cap \mathbb{V}_N} \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

see in particular Proposition 3.1 in [3]. Therefore existence of a strong solution of 3.2 follows from Theorem 5.1 of [3].  $\square$

#### 4. THE MICROSCOPIC INVARIANT MEASURE

In this section we study invariant measures of (1.1) and the associated Dirichlet forms. Since (1.1) conserves the sum  $\sum_{x=1}^N \phi_t(x) = \sum_{x=1}^N \phi_0(x)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , each subspace  $\mathbb{V}_N^c = \mathbb{V}_N + c\mathbf{1}$ , with  $c > 0$ , supports an invariant measure. Therefore it is natural to fix  $c > 0$  and consider only initial conditions  $\phi_0$  in  $\mathbb{V}_N^c$ .

We consider a sequence of i.i.d. real random variables  $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , such that  $X_i$  has probability density  $\exp(-V)dr$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then  $q = \mathbb{E}[X_1^2]$ , see (1.3). For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $S_n := X_1 + \dots + X_n$ ,  $S_0 := 0$ . Moreover, for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$T_i^{N,c} := S_{i-1} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} S_j + cN^{1/2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

and

$$\mathbb{V}_N^c := \left\{ \phi \in \mathbb{R}^N : \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i = cN^{3/2} \right\} = \mathbb{V}_N + cN^{1/2}\mathbf{1}.$$

Notice that a.s.  $T^{N,c} = (T_1^{N,c}, \dots, T_N^{N,c}) \in \mathbb{V}_N^c$ . Clearly  $\mathbb{V}_N^c$  is a  $(N-1)$ -dimensional affine subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ; we denote by  $\mathcal{L}^{N-1}(d\phi)$  the induced  $(N-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure.

**Lemma 4.1.** *The law of  $(T_1^{N,c}, \dots, T_N^{N,c})$  on  $\mathbb{V}_N^c$  is*

$$\mathbf{P}_N^c(d\phi) := \frac{1}{Z_N^c} \mathbf{1}_{(\phi \in \mathbb{V}_N^c)} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}_N(\phi)\} \mathcal{L}^{N-1}(d\phi), \quad (4.1)$$

where  $Z_N^c$  is a normalization constant and  $\mathcal{H}_N$  is the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_N(\phi) := \sum_{x=2}^N V(\phi(x) - \phi(x-1)), \quad \phi \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

*Proof.* It is enough to prove the case  $c = 0$ . We set  $\tau : \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^N$ ,

$$\tau(y) := -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} y_k \cdot \mathbf{1} + (0, y_1, \dots, y_{N-1}), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}.$$

For all  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(T^{N,0})] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} f(\tau(y)) e^{-V(y_1) - V(y_2 - y_1) - \dots - V(y_{N-1} - y_{N-2})} dy_1 \dots dy_{N-1}.$$

Now we define the  $(N-1) \times (N-1)$  matrix

$$L := (L_{ij}), \quad L_{ij} = \mathbf{1}_{(i=j)} - \frac{1}{N},$$

so that  $\tau_i(y) = (Ly)_{i-1}$  for all  $i = 2, \dots, N$ . Let us now use the following change of variable

$$\mathbb{R}^{N-1} \ni y \mapsto (\phi_2, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \quad \phi_i := (Ly)_{i-1}, \quad i = 2, \dots, N.$$

Moreover we set

$$\phi_1 := -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} y_k = -(\phi_2 + \dots + \phi_N).$$



Then  $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathbb{V}_N$  and  $y_1 = \phi_2 - \phi_1$ ,  $y_i - y_{i-1} = \phi_{i+1} - \phi_i$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ . Finally

$$\mathbb{E}[f(T^{N,0})] = \frac{1}{|\det L|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} f(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) e^{-V(\phi_2 - \phi_1) - \dots - V(\phi_N - \phi_{N-1})} d\phi_2 \dots d\phi_N. \quad \square$$

We also set  $\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+} = \mathbf{P}_N^c(\cdot | \Omega_N^+)$ . Then

$$\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}(d\phi) = \frac{1}{Z_N^{c,+}} 1_{(\phi \in \mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+)} \exp\{-\mathcal{H}_N(\phi)\} \mathcal{L}^{N-1}(d\phi), \quad (4.2)$$

where  $Z_N^{c,+} = \mathbf{P}_N^c(\Omega_N^+)$  is a normalization constant.

Since  $\mathbb{V}_N^c = c\mathbf{1} + \mathbb{V}_N$  is an affine space obtained by a translation of  $\mathbb{V}_N$ , it is natural to consider  $\mathbb{V}_N$  as its tangent space. More precisely, for any  $F : \mathbb{V}_N^c \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  in  $C^1$ , one can define a gradient  $\nabla_{\mathbb{V}_N} F : \mathbb{V}_N^c \mapsto \mathbb{V}_N$  as follows

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} F(\phi + \varepsilon v) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \nabla_{\mathbb{V}_N} F(\phi), v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}_N}, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathbb{V}_N^c, v \in \mathbb{V}_N,$$

recall (2.4). Notice that  $\nabla_{\mathbb{V}_N}$  is the gradient operator in  $\mathbb{V}_N$  with respect to the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{V}_N}$ . If  $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and  $\phi \in \mathbb{V}_N^c$ , then it is possible to compare the gradient in  $\mathbb{V}_N$  and the standard gradient  $\nabla F = (\frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi_i}, i = 1, \dots, N)$

$$\nabla_{\mathbb{V}_N} F = \sigma \sigma^T \nabla F, \quad \|\nabla_{\mathbb{V}_N} F\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2 = \|\sigma^T \nabla F\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2 = \langle \nabla F, \sigma \sigma^T \nabla F \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N}.$$

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $c > 0$ .*

- (1) *The Markov process  $(\phi(t, \phi_0))_{t \geq 0, \phi_0 \in \mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+}$  is the diffusion generated by the symmetric Dirichlet Form in  $L^2(\Omega_N^+, \mathbf{P}_N^{c,+})$ , closure of*

$$\begin{aligned} C_b^1(\Omega_N^+) \ni F &\mapsto e^{c,N}(F, F) := \int \sum_{x,y \in \Gamma_N} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi(x)} [\sigma \sigma^T]_{xy} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi(y)} d\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+} \\ &= \int \|\nabla_{\mathbb{V}_N} F\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2 d\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}. \end{aligned}$$

- (2)  *$\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}$  is the only tempered invariant probability measure of  $\phi$  on  $\mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+$ , where temperedness means having finite second moment.*

**Proof.** Closability of  $e^{c,N}$  on  $C_b^1(\Omega_N^+)$  follows from Theorem 2.1, since the Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_N$  and the set  $\mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+$  are convex and  $\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}$  is therefore log-concave (see Theorem 9.4.11 of [1]). Since  $\mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+$  is locally compact, by Fukushima's theory of Dirichlet forms there exists a continuous Markov process  $(\psi_t, t \geq 0)$  in  $\mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+$ , starting from quasi-every  $\psi_0 \in \mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+$ , weak solution of (1.1). By the pathwise uniqueness result of Lemma 3.2,  $(\psi_t, t \geq 0)$  and  $(\phi_t, t \geq 0)$  are identical in law if  $\psi_0 = \phi_0$  and therefore  $(\phi_t, t \geq 0, \phi_0 \in \mathbb{V}_N^c \cap \Omega_N^+)$  is the Markov process associated with  $e^{c,N}$ .

The second assertion follows from point (e) of Theorem 2.1, since  $\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+} \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^N)$  by the convexity of  $V$  and in particular (1.3).  $\square$

## 5. THE RESCALING

Recall now the rescaling map  $\Lambda_N : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto L^2(0, 1)$ , defined in (1.4). In this section we show how the scalar product of  $\mathbb{V}_N$  is transformed under this map. This issue is crucial for the proof of (2.6) and (2.7) in our setting, see Proposition 6.2 below.

We define the linear subspace  $H_N$  of  $L^2(0, 1)$  as the image of  $\Lambda_N$ . We denote by  $1_{I(x)}$  the indicator function of the interval  $I(x)$ , where

$$I(0) := \emptyset, \quad I(x) := [(x-1)/N, x/N), \quad x \in \Gamma_N.$$

Then, by the definition of  $\Lambda_N$

$$H_N = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N a_i 1_{I_i}, \quad (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \right\},$$

i.e.  $H_N$  can be identified with the space of functions on  $[0, 1)$  being constant on  $I(x)$  for all  $x \in \Gamma_N$ .

Let  $B$  denote a standard Brownian motion in  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $B_0 = 0$ . We set

$$\overline{B}_N := \frac{B_{\frac{1}{N}} + B_{\frac{2}{N}} + \dots + B_1}{N}, \quad \overline{B} := \int_0^1 B_r dr.$$

Then we define the process

$$Y_r^N := B_{\lfloor Nr+1 \rfloor / N} - \overline{B}_N, \quad r \in [0, 1),$$

$$Y_r := B_r - \overline{B}, \quad r \in [0, 1],$$

where  $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  denotes the integer part. Notice that almost surely

$$\langle Y^N, 1 \rangle = \langle Y, 1 \rangle = 0, \quad Y_r^N \rightarrow Y_r, \quad \forall r \in [0, 1)$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Both processes are centered Gaussian. Recall that  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2(0,1)}$  denotes the scalar product in  $L^2(0, 1)$ . Now we define

$$\langle h, k \rangle_{H_N} := \mathbb{E} [\langle h, Y^N \rangle \langle k, Y^N \rangle] + \langle h, 1 \rangle \langle k, 1 \rangle, \quad \forall h, k \in H_N,$$

$$\langle h, k \rangle_H := \mathbb{E} [\langle h, Y \rangle \langle k, Y \rangle] + \langle h, 1 \rangle \langle k, 1 \rangle, \quad \forall h, k \in L^2(0, 1).$$

**Lemma 5.1.**

- For any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in H_N$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h, h \rangle_{H_N} &= \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^i \langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, 1_{I(j)} \rangle \right)^2 \\ &= \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 + \mathbb{E} [\langle h, \Lambda_N D \rangle^2], \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where  $D$  is defined in (3.1). In particular, if  $h \neq 0$  then  $\langle h, h \rangle_{H_N} > 0$ .

- For any  $h \in L^2(0, 1)$

$$\langle h, h \rangle_H = \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 + \int_0^1 \left( -\langle h, 1 \rangle + \int_0^t h(s) ds \right)^2 dt.$$

In particular, if  $h \neq 0$ , then  $\langle h, h \rangle_H > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $h \in H_N$  and set

$$k := \sum_i \langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, 1_{I(1)} + \cdots + 1_{I(i)} \rangle 1_{I(i)},$$

and notice that  $\langle k, 1_{I(N)} \rangle = 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h, h \rangle_{H_N} - \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 &= \mathbb{E} [\langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, B_{\lfloor N \cdot + 1 \rfloor / N} \rangle^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, 1_{I(i)} \rangle B_{\frac{i}{N}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \langle k, 1_{I(N)} \rangle B_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \langle k, 1_{I(i)} \rangle \left( B_{\frac{i+1}{N}} - B_{\frac{i}{N}} \right) \right)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \langle k, 1_{I(i)} \rangle^2, \end{aligned}$$

and (5.1) is proven, also recalling Lemma 3.1.

Analogously, for any  $h \in L^2(0, 1)$  we set  $k_r := \int_0^r (h - \langle h, 1 \rangle)$ . Then we find  $k_1 = 0$  and

$$\langle h, h \rangle_H - \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 = \mathbb{E} [\langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, B \rangle^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( k_1 B_1 - \int_0^1 k \, dB \right)^2 \right] = \int_0^1 k^2. \quad \square$$

Therefore  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_N}$ , respectively  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ , defines a scalar product on  $H_N$ , resp. on  $L^2(0, 1)$ . We define the Hilbert space  $H$ , completion of  $L^2(0, 1)$  with respect to the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ . Notice that the associated norms are controlled by the  $L^2(0, 1)$  norm.

**Lemma 5.2.** *For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in H_N$*

$$\|h\|_{H_N}^2 \leq \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

*For all  $h \in L^2(0, 1)$*

$$\|h\|_H^2 \leq \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

*Proof.* For any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in H_N$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h, h \rangle_{H_N} - \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 &= \mathbb{E} [\langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, B_{\lfloor N \cdot + 1 \rfloor / N} \rangle^2] \\ &\leq \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \mathbb{E} [\|B_{\lfloor N \cdot + 1 \rfloor / N}\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2] = \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{i}{N} \\ &\leq \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\langle h, h \rangle_{H_N} \leq \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 + \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 = \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

Analogously, for any  $h \in L^2(0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h, h \rangle_H - \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 &= \mathbb{E} [\langle h - \langle h, 1 \rangle, B \rangle^2] \leq \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \mathbb{E} [\|B\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2] \\ &= \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \int_0^1 t \, dt \leq \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We define now the image measures of  $\mathbf{P}_N^c$  and  $\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}$  under  $\Lambda_N$ ,

$$\nu_N^c := \Lambda_N^*(\mathbf{P}_N^c), \quad \nu_N^{c,+} := \Lambda_N^*(\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}), \quad c > 0,$$

where  $\Lambda_N$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_N^c$  and  $\mathbf{P}_N^{c,+}$  are defined, respectively, in (1.4), (4.1) and (4.2). Finally, we set for all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$

$$H_N^c := \{h \in H_N, \langle h, 1 \rangle = c\}, \quad H^c := \{h \in H, \langle h, 1 \rangle = c\};$$

in particular,  $H_N^0$  and  $H^0$  are Hilbert space w.r.t. to the restrictions of  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_N}$ , respectively  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$ , that we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h, k \rangle_{H_N^0} &:= \mathbb{E} [\langle h, Y^N \rangle \langle k, Y^N \rangle], & \forall h, k \in H_N^0, \\ \langle h, k \rangle_{H^0} &:= \mathbb{E} [\langle h, Y \rangle \langle k, Y \rangle], & \forall h, k \in H^0.\end{aligned}$$

By (5.1) and Lemma 3.1, we see that the scalar product in  $H_N^0$  is the push-forward of the scalar product in  $\mathbb{V}_N$  under  $\Lambda_N$ , i.e. for all  $h \in H_N^0$

$$\|h\|_{H_N^0}^2 = \|\Lambda_N^{-1}h\|_{\mathbb{V}_N}^2. \quad (5.2)$$

As in the case of  $\mathbb{V}_N^c$ , for a differentiable  $F : H_N^c \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  we can define a gradient  $\nabla_{H_N^0} F : H_N^c \mapsto H_N^0$

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} F(k + \varepsilon h) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \nabla_{H_N^0} F(k), h \rangle_{H_N^0}, \quad \forall k \in H_N^c, h \in H_N^0.$$

Analogously for a differentiable  $F : H^c \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  we can define a gradient  $\nabla_{H^0} F : H^c \mapsto H^0$

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} F(k + \varepsilon h) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \nabla_{H^0} F(k), h \rangle_{H^0}, \quad \forall k \in H^c, h \in H^0.$$

Moreover,  $\Lambda_N : \mathbb{V}_N^c \mapsto H_N^c$  is bijective. Then, for any  $f \in C_b^1(H_N^c)$  we have  $f \circ \Lambda_N \in C_b^1(\mathbb{V}_N^c)$  and

$$\sum_{x, y \in \Gamma_N} \frac{\partial(f \circ \Lambda_N)}{\partial \phi(x)} [\sigma \sigma^T]_{xy} \frac{\partial(f \circ \Lambda_N)}{\partial \phi(y)} = \frac{1}{N^4} \|\nabla_{H_N^0} f\|_{H_N^0}^2 \circ \Lambda_N. \quad (5.3)$$

Then we have for any  $\varphi, \psi \in C_b^1(H_N^c)$

$$\mathcal{E}^{c,N}(f, g) := \int_{K_N} \langle \nabla_{H_N^0} \varphi, \nabla_{H_N^0} \psi \rangle_{H_N^0} d\nu_N^{c,+} = N^4 e^{c,N}(\varphi \circ \Lambda_N, \psi \circ \Lambda_N).$$

We obtain readily from Proposition 4.2

**Proposition 5.3.** *The bilinear form  $(\mathcal{E}^{c,N}, C_b^1(H_N^c))$  is closable in  $L^2(\nu_N^{c,+})$  and the closure  $(\mathcal{E}^{c,N}, D(\mathcal{E}^{c,N}))$  is a symmetric Dirichlet form with associated Markov process  $\Phi^N$ .*

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

**6.1. The limit equation.** We recall that  $B$  denotes a standard real Brownian motion and

$$\overline{B} := \int_0^1 B_r dr,$$

We define the process

$$Y_\theta^c := q^{1/2} (B_\theta - \overline{B}) + c, \quad \theta \in [0, 1],$$

and  $\nu^{c,+}$  as the law of  $Y^c$  conditioned to be non-negative on  $[0, 1]$ . In other words, if  $\nu^c$  is the law of  $Y^c$  and  $K := \{h \in L^2(0, 1), h \geq 0\}$ , then  $\nu^{c,+} = \nu^c(\cdot | K)$ . The following result has been proven in [5].

**Proposition 6.1.**

- (1) For all  $u_0 \in H^c \cap K$  there exists a unique strong solution of (1.5). We denote  $X_t(u_0) := u(t, \cdot) \in H^c \cap K$

- (2) The process  $(X_t(u_0))_{t \geq 0, u_0 \in H^c \cap K}$  is the diffusion associated with the Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}^c, D(\mathcal{E}^c))$ , closure of the symmetric form

$$\mathcal{E}^c(\varphi, \psi) := \int \langle \nabla_{H^0} \varphi, \nabla_{H^0} \psi \rangle_{H^0} d\nu^{c,+}, \quad \forall \varphi, \psi \in C_b^1(H^c).$$

- (3)  $\nu^{c,+}$  is the only invariant measure of  $(X_t(u_0))_{t \geq 0, u_0 \in H^c \cap K}$ .

**6.2. Proof of (2.6) and (2.7).** We are going to show now that, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\nu_N^{c,+}$  converges weakly to  $\nu^{c,+}$  and the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{H_N^0}$  converges to  $\|\cdot\|_{H^0}$ , in the sense of (2.6) and (2.7).

**Proposition 6.2.** *In the notation of section 5*

- (1) *If  $c > 0$  then  $\nu_N^{c,+}$  converges weakly in  $H$  to  $\nu^{c,+}$  as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$ .*  
(2) *We have*

$$\frac{1}{6} \|h\|_{H^0} \leq \|h\|_{H_N^0} \leq \|h\|_{H^0} \quad \forall h \in H_N^0, N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.1)$$

- (3) *Denoting by  $\Pi_N : H^0 \rightarrow H_N^0$  the orthogonal projections induced by the scalar product of  $H^0$ , we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} = \|h\|_{H^0} \quad \forall h \in H^0. \quad (6.2)$$

*Proof.* We start with weak convergence of  $\nu_N^{c,+}$  to  $\nu^{c,+}$ . We set  $\nu_N^c := \Lambda_N^*(\mathbf{P}_N^c)$ , i.e.  $\nu_N^c$  is the law of the process  $Y^{c,N}$

$$Y_\theta^{c,N} := \frac{S_{[N\theta]} - \bar{S}_N}{\sqrt{N}} + c, \quad \theta \in [0, 1).$$

By the invariance principle,  $\nu_N^c$  converges weakly to the law  $\nu^c$  of  $Y^c := q^{1/2}(B - \bar{B}) + c$ , where  $q$  is defined in (1.3). We have to prove now that for  $c > 0$

$$\nu^c(\partial K) = \mathbb{P} \left( \inf_{\theta \in [0,1]} Y_\theta^c = 0 \right) = 0.$$

Notice that, by the symmetry of  $Y^c$  with respect to time inversion  $\theta \mapsto 1 - \theta$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \inf_{\theta \in [0,1]} Y_\theta^c = 0 \right) \leq 2 \mathbb{P} \left( \inf_{\theta \in [0,1/2]} Y_\theta^c = 0 \right).$$

Notice that  $\bar{B} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/3)$ . By a standard Gaussian computation, it is easy to see that the law of  $(Y_\theta^c, \theta \in [0, 1/2])$  is equivalent to the law of

$$V_\theta := q^{1/2}(B_\theta - Z) + c, \quad \theta \in [0, 1/2],$$

where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/3)$  is independent of  $B$ . Since the minimum value of  $B$  over  $[0, 1/2]$  has the law of  $|B_{1/2}|$ , we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \inf_{\theta \in [0,1/2]} V_\theta = 0 \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( |B_{1/2}| = Z - q^{-1/2}c \right) = 0$$

and therefore  $\mathbb{P}(\inf_{\theta \in [0,1/2]} Y_\theta^c = 0) = 0$ . Then  $\nu^c(\partial K) = 0$  and  $\nu_N^c(\cdot | K) = \nu_N^{c,+}$  converges weakly to  $\nu^c(\cdot | K) = \nu^{c,+}$ .

We prove now (6.1) and (6.2). The key result is the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.3.** *For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in H_N$*

$$\|h\|_{H_N}^2 + \frac{1}{6N^2} \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 = \|h\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{6N^2} \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2. \quad (6.3)$$

*Proof.* Since  $\langle h, 1 \rangle_H = \langle h, 1 \rangle_{H_N} = \langle h, 1 \rangle$ , then (6.3) is equivalent to

$$\|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{H_N}^2 = \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{6N^2} \|h - \langle h, 1 \rangle\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2, \quad \forall h \in H_N.$$

This, in turn, is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle h, B_{[N+1]/N} \rangle^2] = \mathbb{E} [\langle h, B \rangle^2] + \frac{1}{6N^2} \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2, \quad \forall h \in H_N^0.$$

This formula can be proven by noting that for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$B_{\frac{i}{N}} = N \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} B_s ds + N \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} (B_{\frac{i}{N}} - B_s) ds.$$

Indeed, it follows that for all  $h \in H_N$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\langle h, B_{[N+1]/N} \rangle^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle B_{\frac{i}{N}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\langle h, B \rangle^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle N \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} (B_{\frac{i}{N}} - B_s) ds \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2N^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle h, B \rangle \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle \langle h, 1_{(j)} \rangle \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{j}{N}} B_r dr \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{j}{N}} (B_{\frac{i}{N}} - B_s) ds \right] \end{aligned}$$

By independence of increments of the Brownian motion, the second term in the right hand side is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle N \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} (B_{\frac{i}{N}} - B_s) ds \right)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{3N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{3N^2} \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

Now, for the third term, we need to calculate

$$I_{ij} := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{j}{N}} B_r dr \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{j}{N}} (B_{\frac{i}{N}} - B_s) ds \right].$$

Again by independence we have  $I_{ij} = 0$  if  $j < i$ . On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} i < j &\implies I_{ij} = \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{j}{N}} dr \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} \left( \frac{i}{N} - s \right) ds = \frac{1}{2N^3}, \\ i = j &\implies I_{ii} = \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} dr \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^{\frac{i}{N}} (s - r) ds = \frac{1}{6N^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we must compute for all  $h \in H_N$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle \langle h, 1_{(j)} \rangle + \frac{1}{3N} \sum_i \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle^2 &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i \neq j} \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle \langle h, 1_{(j)} \rangle + \frac{1}{3N} \sum_i \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j} \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle \langle h, 1_{(j)} \rangle - \frac{1}{6N} \sum_i \langle h, 1_{(i)} \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{2N} \langle h, 1 \rangle^2 - \frac{1}{6N^2} \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have proven that for all  $h \in H_N$

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle h, B_{[N+1]/N} \rangle^2] = \mathbb{E} [\langle h, B \rangle^2] + \frac{1}{6N^2} \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \frac{1}{2N} \langle h, 1 \rangle^2$$

and choosing  $h$  such that  $\langle h, 1 \rangle = 0$  we have the desired result.  $\square$

*End of the proof of Proposition 6.2.* We prove now (6.1), namely the estimate

$$\frac{1}{6} \|h\|_{H_N^0}^2 \leq \|h\|_{H^0}^2 \leq \|h\|_{H_N^0}^2, \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, h \in H_N^0. \quad (6.4)$$

The second inequality of (6.4) follows from (6.3). For the first inequality, recall now (5.1), where we proved that for all  $h \in H_N^0$

$$\|h\|_{H_N^0}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^i \langle 1_{(j)}, h \rangle \right)^2.$$

Then we obtain for all  $h \in H_N^0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 &= N \sum_{i=1}^N \langle 1_{(i)}, h \rangle^2 = N \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^i \langle 1_{(j)}, h \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \langle 1_{(j)}, h \rangle \right)^2 + N \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \langle 1_{(j)}, h \rangle \right)^2 \\ &\leq 4N \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^i \langle 1_{(j)}, h \rangle \right)^2 + N \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \langle 1_{(j)}, h \rangle \right)^2 \leq 5N^2 \|h\|_{H_N^0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.3) we obtain the first inequality and (6.4) is proven.

We prove now (6.2), namely we prove that, denoting by  $\Pi_N : H^0 \rightarrow H_N$  the orthogonal projections induced by the scalar product of  $H^0$ , we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} = \|h\|_{H^0} \quad \forall h \in H^0.$$

We denote by  $P_N : L^2(0,1) \mapsto L^2(0,1)$  the following projection

$$P_N h := \sum_{i=1}^N N \langle h, 1_{I(i)} \rangle 1_{I(i)}, \quad h \in L^2(0,1). \quad (6.5)$$

Then  $P_N$  is an orthogonal projector with respect to the scalar product of  $L^2(0,1)$  and for all  $h \in L^2(0,1)$ ,  $\|h - P_N h\|_{L^2(0,1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, let us fix  $h \in L^2(0,1) \cap H^0$ ; then we have

$$\|P_N h\|_{H_N^0}^2 = \mathbb{E} [\langle Y^N, h \rangle^2] \rightarrow \mathbb{E} [\langle Y, h \rangle^2] = \|h\|_{H^0}^2, \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.6)$$

Now we claim that  $\|\Pi_N h\|_{H^0}^2 \rightarrow \|h\|_{H^0}^2$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed,  $\Pi_N$  is the element of minimal  $H^0$ -distance from  $h$  in  $H_N^0$ . Then, since  $P_N h$  belongs to  $H_N^0$ , by Lemma 5.2

$$\|\Pi_N h - h\|_{H^0} \leq \|P_N h - h\|_{H^0} \leq \|P_N h - h\|_{L^2(0,1)} \rightarrow 0, \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.7)$$

Now, by (6.3)

$$\|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0}^2 = \|\Pi_N h\|_{H^0}^2 + \frac{1}{6N^2} \|\Pi_N h\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \geq \|\Pi_N h\|_{H^0}^2 \rightarrow \|h\|_{H^0}^2, \quad N \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} \geq \|h\|_{H^0}.$$

On the other hand, by (6.4)

$$\|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} \leq \|P_N h\|_{H_N^0} + \|P_N h - \Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} \leq \|P_N h\|_{H_N^0} + \|P_N h - \Pi_N h\|_{H^0}.$$

Since  $\lim_N (P_N h - \Pi_N h) = 0$  in  $H^0$  by (6.7), then by (6.6) we find

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} \leq \|h\|_{H^0}.$$

If we set now

$$\psi_N : H^0 \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \quad \psi_N(h) = \|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0},$$

then  $\psi_N$  is Lipschitz-continuous in the  $H^0$ -norm uniformly in  $N$ , since

$$\|\Pi_N h\|_{H_N^0} \leq \|\Pi_N h\|_{H^0} \leq \|h\|_{H^0}$$

by (6.1) and by the definition of  $\Pi_N$ . Moreover  $\psi_N(h) \rightarrow \|h\|_{H^0}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $h$  in  $L^2(0, 1) \cap H^0$ . Since  $L^2(0, 1) \cap H^0$  is dense in  $H^0$ , this concludes the proof of Proposition 6.2.  $\square$

**6.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1.** In order to prove Theorem 1.1, it is now enough to notice that by Propositions 5.3, 6.1 and 6.2, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 apply and yield the desired convergence result.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, G. Savaré (2005), *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the spaces of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, G. Savaré, L. Zambotti (2007), *Existence and Stability for Fokker-Planck equations with log-concave reference measure*, preprint posted on <http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.2458>.
- [3] E. Cépa, (1998), *Problème de Skorohod multivoque*, Ann. Prob. **28**, no. 2, 500-532.
- [4] G. Da Prato, J. Zabczyk (2002), *Second order partial differential equations in Hilbert spaces*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, n. 293.
- [5] A. Debussche, L. Zambotti (2007), *Conservative Stochastic Cahn-Hilliard equation with reflection*, Annals of Probability **35**, no. 5, 1706-1739.
- [6] P. Collet, G. Dunlop, T. Gobron (1995), *Conservative Langevin dynamics of solid-on-solid interfaces*, J. Statist. Phys. **79**, no. 1-2, 215-229.
- [7] T. Funaki (2005), *Stochastic Interface Models*. In: Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics, Ecole d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXIII - 2003 (ed. J. Picard), 103-274, Lect. Notes Math., **1869**, Springer.
- [8] T. Funaki, S. Olla (2001), *Fluctuations for  $\nabla\phi$  interface model on a wall*, Stoch. Proc. and Appl. **94**, 1-27.
- [9] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima and M. Takeda (1994), *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York.
- [10] T. Nishikawa (2002), *Hydrodynamic limit for the Ginzburg-Landau  $\nabla\phi$  interface model with a conservation law*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, **9**, pp.481-519.
- [11] T. Nishikawa (2007), *Large deviations for the Ginzburg-Landau  $\nabla\phi$  interface model with a conservation law*, in preparation.
- [12] H. Spohn (1993), *Interface motion in models with stochastic dynamics*, J. Stat. Phys. **71**, 1081-1132.
- [13] L. Zambotti (2007), *A conservative evolution of the Brownian excursion*, in preparation.

LABORATOIRE DE PROBABILITÉS ET MODÈLES ALÉATOIRES (CNRS U.M.R. 7599), UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 6 – PIERRE ET MARIE CURIE, U.F.R. MATHÉMATIQUES, CASE 188, 4 PLACE JUSSIEU, 75252 PARIS CEDEX 05, FRANCE

*E-mail address:* zambotti@ccr.jussieu.fr